DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 621 SO 023 740

AUTHOR McWhinnie, Harold J.
TITLE The Ideology of Vicktor Lowenfeld: A Review of Research.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; *Creativity; Curriculum Development; Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Individual Development
IDENTIFIERS *Lowenfeld (Viktor)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper was to present and update the evaluation of the ideas of Vicktor Lowenfeld and his place in the history of art education. This task was undertaken in light of developments that have taken place in the decades since his death. Among those developments are: (1) efforts to educate all individuals in the least retrictive environment; (2) concern for educational opportunities in the arts for all, especially the handicapped and elderly; (3) new insights into the nature and functioning of the brain; and (4) the general concern for education for a quality of life and better environment for all. Lowenfeld's views on creativity and the creative potential movement of the 1960s are reflected in such developments. It is a credit to Lowenfeld's accomplishments, as well as to his essential genius, that one after so long can return over and over again to his work for inspiration both philosophical and psychological. (Contains 28 references.) (Author/SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 621

DRAFT

The Ideology of Vicktor Lowenfeld
(A Review of Research)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By

Harold J. McWhinnie
Department of Design
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
HAROLD J. McWHINNIE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Fall 1991

SO 023 740

Prepared for:
Running Head:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to present and update the evaluation of the ideas of Vicktor Lowenfeld and his place in the history of art education. This task was undertaken in the light of developments that have taken place within art education in the decades since his death. It is a credit to Lowenfeld's accomplishments, as well as to his essential genius, that one after, so long can return over and over again to his work for inspiration both philosophical as well as psychological.

INTRODUCTION

A conference at the University of Illinois (October 1984) which dealt with broad aspects of child development theories in relation to art education research featured a presentation by David Feldman (Feldman, 1984) that looked at new ideas in child development with reference to practice in the teaching of art. At this same conference Wilson (1984) and Efland (1984) showed how Lowenfeld's ideas contributed to basic practices in art education which were basically self-expressive rather then disciplined-centered or content orientated. As the decade have moved forward, the idea of DBAE dominated the art education dialogue and with it the writings and ideas of Lowenfeld seem to become all the less relevant to concerns for education in art and design.

McWhinnie was one of the first art educators to undertake a critical evaluation of Lowenfeld and his work (McWhinnie, 1963). In that early paper he argued that Lowenfeld in his work and in his writings had neglected the subject matter of art as a basis for art curriculum. That paper was published before Barkan prepared his famous trilogy of artists, art critics, art historians (Barkan, 1965) as a model for curriculum decisions in art education. It is the Barkan model that became the curriculum formulation for both the aesthetic education project and DBAE as sponsored by the Getty Trust.

There is one major difference between Barkan's early ideas and DBAE which is that Barkan spoke of the artists, art critic and art historians as "models of Inquiry" not academic disciplines of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. There is an important difference between art critic as a model for inquiry in the visual arts and the teaching of art criticism as a discipline. In the Barkan model the word has been employed as a noun, referring to a process; in the DBAE made it

is an adjective describing a body of content and procedures. The general climate of educational thinking in the United Stated in the early 1960's necessitated a significant shift from the thinking of the 1950's. Lowenfeld was above all a product of the 1940's. Historically speaking, Lowenfeld and his ideas were an outgrowth of the child-study movement of the 1940's. The psychological dynamics of his ideas had grown in the Vienna of Siegmund Freud and his thinking had been further nurtured by the views of Carl Jung. In 1965 Barkan provided a useful service to which art education today in 1965 to other concerns.

In the 1960's educational thought had begun to move away from child-study as a curriculum model, to an emphasis on and renewed interest in subject matter. This shift first became evident in the various federally funded projects in math and science in the early 1960's. By 1965 a group of art educators led by Manuel Barkan proposed that art education as a field of study needed to return to the subject matter of art as a basis for decisions about curriculum.

Art Educators such as David Ecker, June McFee, Elliot Eisner, Manuel Barkan, and Vincent Lanier all felt that it was necessary to move the field beyond the assumptions that Lowenfeld had held as to the nature of child growth and development in art, the nature of creativity, the possibility to change perceptual style, and the role of adult art in the education of children.

McWhinnie wrote a second assessment of the work of Lowenfeld. (McWhinnie, 1970) In that article he attempted an evaluation of Lowenfeld's work within the contest of humanistic education, as a part of aesthetic education. That second article tried to place Lowenfeld's work within the mainstream of the "return to the subject matter of art." The basic argument of the 1970 paper was that the strong humanistic aspects of Lowenfeld's ideas towards child growth in art did seem to parallel the aims of the arts in education movement. The earlier criticism of Lowenfeld had focused upon the inadequacies of his psychological theories of child growth and development in art.

Status of Art Education in 1960-61

In 1960, Jerome Bruner had just published his Towards a Theory of Instruction and the new curricula in math and science were heralded as sign posts to the future. In the general educational climate of the early 1960's it was essential because of these pressures to call for curriculum reform in art education and to turn the focus away from the learner and towards the discipline of art. The proposed changes in art education led to an exciting time of innovation and change in the decade of the 1960's. It fostered the return to the content of art and a conceptualization of curriculum in art that grew out of Barkan's work.

If it was Barkan's role to provide the basic model that would keep to revolutionize art education, then it has been Vincent Lanier's professional role to be art education's most persistent critic. In 1962 he was among the first writers to indicate some of the weaknesses of the creativity bandwagon (Lanier, 1962). In fact, it was Lanier who first directed attention to some of the weaknesses in the Lowenfeld point of view, especially in relation to the topic of creativity and of creative growth and development in art.

If Barkan looked to subject matter for curriculum decisions, Lanier has always argued for the needs of society as a basis for decisions about what to teach as well as to whom. In his short essay on "The Teaching of Art as Social Revolution" (Lanier, 1968) he voiced the clear call the society needs as the necessary basis of the art educator. If Lanier called attention to the society as a curriculum source, then a third important art educator, David Ecker was to point to the third traditional source for curriculum decisions, the individual.

Ecker (1971), in a paper entitled "The Structure of Affect," pointed to the individual as another source for teaching content. According to Ecker there are four guidelines for building an art curriculum:

1. The understanding of the characteristic attitudes, feelings, values, and beliefs of the young.
2. ....the discovery of each individual's belief, attitudes, and feelings - including those of the teachers - which should be a formal objective of art instruction.

3. The conceptualizing of the art curriculum...as a means of suggesting potential problems for inquiry.

4. And most important the realization that artistic activities and aesthetic concepts should be so relative that the consummatory value of experience is emphasized.

While Ecker has long been on the forefront of the aesthetic education movement, the above statement, clearly states a concern for the individual as a prime source for content. Ecker concludes with these words:

> ...Only a truly aesthetic education, I believe, will bridge the gap between cognition and affect, and will connect the drive for excellence in the 60's with the demand for relevance in the 70's. Only an aesthetic education can restore the integrity of the individual and social experience so out of balance today... (Ecker, 1970).

Compare Ecker's 1971 thoughts with the similarities in the following statement by Lowenfeld.

> From some points of view education has done its task; looking around us today, we can see great material gains. But serious questions can be raised about how much we have been able to educate beyond the making and consuming of objects. Have we in our educational system really put emphasis upon human values? Or have we been blinded by material rewards that we have failed to recognize that the real value of a democracy lie in its most precious good, the individual. (Lowenfeld & Brittan, 1966, pp. 3)

The point here is that Lowenfeld and Ecker seem to be saying similar things about the need for art education in the schools.

McWhinnie made the following assessment of Lowenfeld.

Certain forces abroad in the land today make the uncritical acceptance of the Lowenfeld position no longer desirable. These forces are: (a) the drive for excellence in education and the re-emphasis on the subject matter content in all subjects; (b) the current disfavor towards the child-centered school; and (c) the increase in sophistication of the research in creativity and perception which makes some of Lowenfeld's assumptions no longer tenable. McWhinnie, 1970

There are today new social pressures which demand yet another evaluation of Lowenfeld and his work. Some of these new social demands are:

1. Concern for the education of all individuals in the least restrictive environment (Mainstreaming).
2. Concern for education opportunities in the arts for all, especially the handicapped and the elderly.
3. New insights into the nature of the brain itself and in alternative modes of functioning and behavior.
4. The general concern for education for a quality of life as well as for better environment for all.

Lowenfeld, early in his own career, spoke out for all these issues. The need for an education for self-actualization and for learning in the affective domain necessitates a new emphasis on the individual and on his own unique reactions to the subject matter content of art. The increase and sophistication of research in education, as well as insights from the research in altered states of awareness, now make many of Lowenfeld's early assumptions tenable and insightful. In Part Two of this paper, these new research directions will be covered in some detail. When Lowenfeld wrote about creativity he may have been Foreshadowing the new research insights now being published.

One of the reasons for criticism of Lowenfeld and his work in the late 1960's and early 1970's was his strong views toward creativity and the creative potential movement of the 1960's. When the creativity bandwagon seemed to slow down and falter; Lowenfeld, by his close association with it, came to be viewed as not relevant to the emerging view of aesthetic education. Lowenfeld stated his views in an often quoted passage as follows:

> Recent experiments in finding attributes which are responsible for general creativeness in individuals have revealed that they are the same attributes as found in any creative art process. Vice versa, it can then be said that creative art processes stimulate creativeness in genera. This very important fact shows vividly the significance of art education in a democratic society. It is here the philosophy of art education distinctly differs from the so-called fine arts. Whereas the emphasis in art education is on the effect which creative process have on individuals, the sensitivity derived from aesthetic experiences, it is needless to say that, with the improved creativeness of the individual, his greater sensitivity towards experiences, and his increased ability to integrate them, the quality of his aesthetic product will grow. (Lowenfeld, 1975).

The sentence, "it can be then said that creative art processes stimulate creativeness in general," has probably caused more controversy and debate than anything else he wrote.

The most thorough assessment of Lowenfeld to date was made by the late Manuel Barkan. In April 1965, Barkan gave the second Lowenfeld Memorial lecture in Philadelphia. In that address entitled, "Viktor Lowenfeld: His Impact on Art Education," Barkan wrote as follows:

> Art Education today is in the midst of change, and the contribution of Viktor Lowenfeld, though of the very recent past, needs to be assessed not only in relation to the past but also in relation to the present and the emerging future. I would suggest that the present scene already presages some of the potentialities of the future, and that whatever positive promise the future may hold can only be realized through the critical examination of much which is assumed to be right, proper and sensible in the present. I would contend further that it is only the ability to discover what faults the present harbours, and indeed it is only to the degree to which we can make our present assumptions problematical that we may even hope to generate the ideological power which positive progress in the future will require. (Barkan, 1965, p. 4)

What Barkan is speaking about in the above passage is the failure of Lowenfeld's "creativity hypothesis" as well as his own explorations of creativity (Barkan, 1962). Manuel Barkan was a prophet as well as a follower. He laid the conceptual groundwork for two major movements in art education: (1) the foundations movement and (2) the asesthetic education thrust and in a large part, Barkan based his assessment of Lowenfeld on work by McFee and Ecker.

The rationale for this assessment of Lowenfeld can be found in the following passage from Barkan.

> Whether Viktor Lowenfeld would see eye to eye with some of the current emering forces in art education, I would not presume to say. I have no doubt, however, that were he here today, his scholarly character would lead him to analyze to synthesize and to redefine inherent current problems in the field. For my part, I can conceive of neither any better nor productive way to honor Viktor Lowenfeld's impact on art education than to try to do so both by reviewing his major contributions and by recognizing the thoughtful and scholarly criticism which some of his contributions have attracted. To overlook such criticism would be tantamount to overlooking Viktor Lowenfeld's contributions themselves. (Barkan, 1965, pp. 6)

In this first part of the paper, I have tried to show that Lowenfeld can be related to all three bases for curriculum: (1) the child, (2) the society, and (3) the subject matter to be taught. This is one of his richnesses as a thinker, that he was not limited to one point of view and once can take

from his writing inspirations for future youth in art teaching. In the next section I will turn my attentions to specific areas of research.

Part Two

Review of Research Relevant to Lowenfeld's Hypotheses

Barkan's own conclusion might be rephrased to constitute a critique of the current directions in art education. But what of the substantive criticisms that he levelled against Lowenfeld and his work? The main critique was directed against Lowenfeld's theory of the visual and haptic types in child growth and development.

(1) Work in EEG Research

Both EEG research by W. Grey Walter (1951) and the current research with consciousness-expanding chemical s(Fischer, 1968) have given us far more sophisticated insights into the functioning of the human brain. These new insights parallel to a considerable degree, Lowenfeld's early more intuitive formulations. It would seem that there are distinct brain wave patterns and these differ with individuals. It is still, however, very much an open question as to whether or not an individual can change these basic patterns or orientation. Lowenfeld thought that he could not, but the recent research in the use of EEC's seems to argue that one may be able to do so. Someone with Lowenfeld's orientation is now needed to redirect our education towards a greater concern for the individual and for social ends and move it away from an excess of concern with cognitive goals and discipline-centeredness as directions for art education curricula.

In the past ten years there has been a great interest in Betty Edward's book Drawing from the Right Side of the Brain (Edwards, 1979). What we now know about the nature and functioning of the two halves of the brain causes us to look at Lowenfeld's perceptual types with a new interest.

(2) **Research in Perceptual Learning in Art**

McWhinnie's own work in perceptual learning in art, which was based on the earlier work of McFee and Witkin seemed to indicate that perceptual modes of functioning are considerably

more stable and less open to intervention. In that work he claimed that research in the area of perception and perceptual learning may show that the individual's preferred ways of perceiving and were subject to modification by art experiences. As a consequence of a large body of experimental work, McWhinnie concluded that the child's preferred ways of knowing and perceiving were much more stable than had been assumed by McFee (1961).

The new work being done as a consequence of mainstreaming in the arts may indicate that the original McWhinnie hypothesis that perceptual learning was possible was correct ant that his 1970 revision was indeed based on incomplete data. Work by Silver (1978) begins to document some of these new directions in perception and art.

McWhinnie in a review of studies in the teaching of drawing indicates that a new look at the Salome-McFee tradition demonstrates the possibility of perceptual learning in art in a way which does seem to invalidate Lowenfeld. The study was included as a part of a conference on the Teaching of Drawing that was held at the Maryland Institute of Art in Baltimore in January of 1983. It was part of a series of conferences to be held at the Institute that will focus upon the major teaching views in today's art curriculum. The conference demonstrated that Lowenfeld's influence was still very much a part of art education thinking. One can consider children's drawing as both a consequence of youth as well as the consequence of learning in art. (McWhinnie, 1983)

Betty Edwards (1979) in her book entitled Drawing from the Right Side of the Brain points to implications for art education that have grown out of an entire decade of research into the nature of the brain. Her basic hypothesis that one can learn to develop the right side of the brain is congruent with June McFee's early idea of perceptual learning in art as curriculum goal. It has been over 30 years since McFee first stated her position (McFee, 1962). If we connect McFee's ideas of perceptual learning in art with Lowenfeld's descriptions of visual and haptic types we may well be able to come to a theoretical synthesis which is congruent with these new discoveries in the research literature.

Mary Rouse (1964) in her dissertation directly compared with Lowenfeld and Witkin theories relative to visual and haptic orientations. She found that both extreme haptic and visuals

were field-independent on several significant Witkin measures and the middle group was field-dependent. (McFee in her P-D theory had hypothesized that the haptics would be field-independent.)

Silver (1978) raises the question of whether or not art symbols can take over some of the functions of language symbols in the thinking of the language impaired child. Like language art symbols are a way of labeling perceptions and imagining experiences. Silver's hypothesis reflects not only the philosophical orientation of art therapy but the work of Pitard (1978). At the symposium for research in art education held at the University of Illinois, Pitard (1980) among others argued for the point of view, that symbols have meaning beyond the visual forms. Art symbols have many possible meanings simultaneously and on many levels.

(3) Child Development Work

A BOOK BY EISNER (1976) HAS PRESENTED ONE OF THE BEST SUMMARIES OF THE RANGE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT ISSUES TO DATE IN GENERAL ART DUCATION HISTORY. MANY OF THE PAPERS AS PRESENTED IN THAT SERIES DO QUESTION VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE LOWENFELD LEGACY. A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS, INITIALLY PREPARED FOR PRESENTATION OVER TWO EARS AS A PUBLIC LECTURE SERIES AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA, WHICH FOCUS ON TWO ASPECTS OF EDUCATION IN THE ARTS: THE SOCIAL CONTEXT IN WHICH IT OCCURS, AND THE COURSE OF INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT WHICH PROVIDES THE OPPORTUNITIES AND LIMITS FOR WHAT CAN OCCUR. THE ESSAYS ARE: "WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT CHILDREN'S ART - AND WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW" BY ELLIOT W. EISNER; " THE UNSEEING EYE: CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE TEACHING OF ART" BY VINCENT LANIER: "GOALS AND ROLES IN THE ART EDUCATION OF CHILDREN" BY RONALD H. SILVERMAN: "CHANGING VIEWS OF CHILDRENS'S ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT: THEIR IMPACT ON CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION" BY ARTHUR D. EFLAND; "IMPRESSION AND EXPRESSION IN ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT" BY H.S. BROUDY; "UNFOLDING OR TEACHING: ON THE OPTIMAL TRAINING OF AESTHETIC INQUIRY BY DAVID W. ECKER; "ART, EDUCATION, AND THE CONSUMPTION OF IMAGES" BY EDMUND BURKE FELDMAN; "THE POLITICS OF ARTS EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA" BY LOUIS P. NASH; "CRYSTAL GAZING, FORECASTING, AND WISHFUL THINKING: THE FUTURE OF THE ARTS EDUCATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION" BY HILDA P. LEWIS; " SCHOOL ART: THE SEARCH FOR AN AVANT-GARDE" BY AL HURWITZ; "BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN THE ARTS AND EDUCATION" BY JUNIUS EDDY; "ELITISM IN THE ARTS AND EGALITARIANISM IN THE COMMUNITY - WHAT'S AN ART EDUCATOR TO DO?" BY JEROME J. HAUSMAN; AND "IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW EDUCATIONAL CONSERVATISM FOR THE FUTURE OF THE ARTS IN EDUCATION" BY ELLIOT W. EISNER.

One gets into questions of imitation when we look at child development theories a study by Palmer (Palmer, 1978)

THIS STUDY UNDERTAKES TO SET FORTH A HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF IMITATION IN AMERICAN ART EDUCATION, BASED ON THE WORK OF FOUR THEORISTS: WALTER SMITHE (1836-86), WILLIAM T. HARRIS (1835-1908), JOHN DEWEY (1859-1952) AND VICTOR LOWENFELD (1903-60). THERE IS A REVIEW OF SOME OF THE VARIANT MEANINGS OF IMITATION PRECEDING AN EXAMINATION OF PLATONIC, ARISTOTELIAN, NEO-CLASSICAL AND ROMANTIC CONCEPTS OF IMITATION. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN EXAMINATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF THE FOUR

EXEMPLARS. FINALLY THE ARGUMENT IS REDUCTED TO THREE MAJOR VIEWS ON IMITATIONS FOUND IN PRACTICES OR THEORY TODAY. ALTHOUGH THIS STUDY SUGGESTS IMPORTANT INSIGHTS INTO THE CONCEPT OF IMITATION, THE CONCEPT REMAINS AN OPEN QUESTION AND NO SINGLE THEORY HAS YET PROVIDED FOR ALL THE NECESSARY PROPERTIES OF IMITATION IN ART.

Development theories have moved in several new directions since Lowenfeld's time. However the newer concerns for instructional theories of child development do not seem to question the earlier views of Lowenfeld.

THE AUTHOR OUTLINES AND DISCUSSES THE FOLLOWING THEORIES OF ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN: BRENT WILSON'S 'ICONOCLASTICISM': JACQUELINE GOODNEW'S HE GRAPHIC PLAN'S: HOWARD GARDNER'S 'THEORY OF ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT'; AND PARSON'S 'DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY OF AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE. THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS ARE NOTED. (Evans, 1978)

THE RECENT REPORT OF THE FINDINGS OF A STUDY BY HOWARD GARDNER, ELLEN WINNER AND MARY KIRCHER, AIMED AT IDENTIFYING CHILDREN'S CONCEPTIONS OF THE ARTS, RAISES A NUMBER OF CRITICAL QUESTIONS THAT REMAIN UNANSWERED. THE STUDY IS FIRST REVIEWED, AND THEN CRITICALLY EXAMINED. IMPROVEMENTS ARE CALLED FOR IN RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, AND A NEED IS SEEN FOR A MOVE TOWARDS A 'DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIOLOGY OF AESTHETIC MEANING'. THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THIS LATTER MAY BE APPROACHED THROUGH THE WORK OF CICOUREL, BASIL BERNSTEIN AND JULES HENRY. (ROSARIO, 1977)

Parsons (1976) has moved a consideration of child development theories into questions of responses to art as well as to the making of art which had been Lowenfeld's most pressing concern.

THE AUTHOR OUTLINES A POSSIBLE COGNITIVE-DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY OF CHILDREN'S AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE IN WHICH HE DISTINGUISHES FOUR STAGES. THE LAST OF WHICH IS NOT NECESSARILY REACHED. HE IS TRYING TO PRODUCE A THEORY PARALLEL TO LAWRENCE KOHLBERG'S WORK ON CHILDREN'S MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE ARTICLE INCLUDES BRIEF DISCUSSIONS OF THE WORK OF JAMES MARK BALDWIN, PIAGET, H. WERNER AND KAPLAN, HOWARD GARDNER, PAVEL MACHOTKA, WINNER AND KIRCHER, IRVIN CHILD, BULLOUGH, C.W. VALENTINE, MYERS AND BARRY MOORE.

These recent studies are cited in this paper to show the range of the questions under study by child development psychologists with a general reference to aesthetic behaviors.

Two major studies have generated much of this new dialogue within developmental theory. The work of Gardner and Project Zero has of course been central to many concerns.

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" IS A RADIO NEWS PROGRAM WHICH FOCUSES ON ISSUES AND DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION. THIS TRANSCRIPT CONTAINS DISCUSSIONS OF THE ARTS IN EDUCATION- -POETRY, MUSIC, AND ART; LEARNING TO SPEAK PROPERLY; THE SEPARATION OF SPEECH AND WRITING; MUSIC EDUCATION; TEACHING CHILDREN ABOUT ART; AND A PILOT TELEVISION PROGRAM WHICH TEACHES MATH SKILLS. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM INCLUDE JOHN MERROW AND WENDY BLAIR, MODERATORS; CONNIE GOLDMAN; STANLEY KIESEL; VICTOR DRILEA ; CONRAD STAWSKI; WINNIFRED HORNER; LEO T. BURLEY; HOWARD GARDNER; ELLSWORTH ERIKSON; AND JESUS TORVINO. (JM)

Roscurio (1977) has responded to the work of Project Zero.

> CRITICIZES THE ARTICLE. "CHILDREN'S CONCEPTIONS OF THE ARTS.' BY HOWARD GARDNER, ELLEN WINNER, AND MARY KIRCHER (JOURNAL OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION, VOL 9, NO 3: 60-77) BECAUSE THE EVALUATIONS OF CHILDREN'S INTELLECTUAL COMPETENCE AND EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE WERE TIED TO THE RESEARCHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF HOW THESE ABILITIES SHOULD BE EXPRESSED, AND NOT LINKED TO THE CHILD'S PSYCHOLOGICAL AND COGNITIVE PROCESSES.

Finally Lewis (it al 1978) has criticized one of the other major studies, the Rochefeller report.

> HILDA LEWIS SUMMARIZES THE PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 1977 REPORT BY THE ARTS, EDUCATION AND AMERICAN SPANEL. HER CHIEF CRITICISM IS THAT THERE ARE NO PROVISIONS FOR EVALUATION OF THE THREE PILOT PROGRAMS', AND THAT ARTS EDUCATION IN OTHER AREAS MAY INITIALLY SUFFER. JUNE MCFEE POINTS TO A NUMBER OMISSIONS WHICH REDUCE THE VALUE OF THE REPORT, IN PARTICULAR ITS FAILURE TO TAKE SUFFICIENTLY INTO ACCOUNT THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT OF YOUNG PEOPLE. MICHAEL DAY OUTLINES THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE REPORT AND FINDS IT A VALUABLE WORK OF REFERENCE. VINCENT LANIER CONSIDERS IT TO BE LARGELY WITHOUT MERIT. HE DISLIKES THE IMPLIED DISTRUST OF PROFESSIONAL ART TEACHERS AND THE INCREASINGLY BUREAUCRATIC ADMINISTRATION OF ART EDUCATION TO WHICH THE EXISTENCE OF THE REPORT BEARS WITNESS.

Conclusions

It may be Lowenfeld's evangelism rather than his scientific endeavors to which we need to return for inspiration and direction in shaping the direction of art education curriculum. The characteristics of such programs could well use Lowenfeld's basic orientation toward art and the individual for some of their inspiration. If education in art is going to be relevant for the future, it must focus upon the individual and on social issues.

Recent efforts by Professor Robert Bersson of James Madison University to establish an organization for Social Theory and Art Education as a part of NAEA demonstrates an increasing awareness by some in the field of art education that aesthetic formalism, the dominant point of view of Ralph Smith and others, is not enough! The strong interest in and growth of programs in art therapy may be a consequence of art education's losing sight of earlier aims and objectives. We need to integrate new insights into our current thinking. The approach to curriculum development in art education by the aesthetic formalist may not be adequate to present concerns and future possibilities.

REFERENCES

Barkan, M. "Viktor Lowenfeld: His Impact on Art Education," Lowenfeld Memorial Lecture, NAEA, Philadelphia Conference, 1965.

Barkan, M. Through Art to Creativity, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1962.

Bruner, J. Towards a Theory of Instruction, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University, 1960.

Ecker, D. W. "Some Inadequate Doctrines," Studies in Art Education, 1962, Vol. 2, No. 1.

Ecker, D. W. "The Structure of Affect in Art Curriculum," Art Education, 1971, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 36-39.

Edwards, B. Drawing From the Right Side Of The Brain, 1979, New York, McMillan.

Eisner, E. W. The Arts, Human Development, and Education (Edited by). Berkely, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation (1976). XVI+226PP. 14 Illus Document type: Book.

Evans, D. Artistic Development: Some Emerging Views For The Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century, Athene (U.K.), No. 66 (Autumn 1978), P. 8-10. Bibliog. Document type: Journal Article.

Harris, D. W. Children's Drawing as Measures of Intellectual Maturity, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963.

Lanier, V. W. "Schisinogenesis in Contemporaty Art Education," Studies in Art Education, 1962, Vol. 2, No. 1.

Lanier, V. W. "The Teaching of Art as Social Revolution," Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.

Lewis, H. P.; McFee, J. K.; Day, M.; Lanier, V. Brief Commentaries on 'Coming To Our Senses': The Significance Of The Arts For American Education. Studies in Art Education (U.S.A.) Vol. 19, PT. 3 (1978), P. 54-63. Bibliog. Document type: Journal Article.

Lowenfeld, V. W., Brittain, L. Creative and Mental Growth, New York, MacMillan, 1966.

McFee, J. K. Development of a Perception - Delination Theory for Art, Stanford, CA. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, 1957.

McFee, J. K. Preparation for Art, Belmont, CA, Wadsworth Press, 1961.

McFee, J. K. "Implication for Change in Art Education," Western Arts Bulletin, 1962.

McWhinnie, H. J.

McWhinnie, H. J.

McWhinnie, H. J.

Palmer, R. D. A History of the Concept of Imitation in American Art Education. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University (1978), 176 pp. Dissertation Abstracts International: Order No. 78-18, 782. Document type: Dissertation.

Parsons, M. J. A suggestion concerning the development of aesthetic experience in children. Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism (U.S. A.), Vol. 34, PT. 3 (Spring 1976), P. 305-14 Bibliog. Document type: Journal Article.

Rosario, J. Children's Conceptions of the Arts: A Critical Response To Howard Gardner. Journal of Aesthetic Education (U.S.A.), Vol. 11, PT. 1 (Jan. 1977). P. 91-100. Bibliog.

Pitard, N. A Consideration of Piget's Theory for Art Education, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1978.

Pitard, N. "The Intelligent Eye - Fact or Fallacy," unpublished paper, 1980.

Rouse, M. J. A Comparison of Witkin's and Lowenfeld's Types, Stanford, CA; unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1964.

Silver, R. A. Developing Cognitive and Creative Skills Through Art, Baltimore, University Park Bress, 1980.

Witkin, H. A. Psychological Differentiation, New York, Wiley, 1962.

University, George Washington. Options in Education, Transcript for March 1, 1976: Art in the Schools, Learning to Speak Properly, Music, Project Zero, Art as Core, and Math Can Be Fun. Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership: National Public Radio, Washington, D.C. 1976 22p. Sponsoring Agency: National Inst. of Education (DHEW). Washington, D.C.

HJM/jad

9/91